UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

ANGIODYNAMICS, INC.,

Plaintiff, '

-v- 17-cv-598 *

C.R. BARD, INC., et al.,

Defendants. *

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE HONORABLE CHRISTIAN F. HUMMEL
March 16, 2020
445 Broadway, Albany, New York

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

BOIES, SCHILLER AND FLEXNER, LLP. BY: Philip Iovieno, Esq. (via teleconf

BY: Philip Iovieno, Esq. (via teleconference)

Anne Nardacci, Esq. Jack Dew, Esq.

30 South Pearl Street

Albany, New York 12207

FOR THE DEFENDANT:

O'MELVENY, MYERS LAW FIRM

BY: Edward Moss, Esq.

Colleen Powers, Esq.

7 Times Square

New York, New York 10036

-AngioDynamics v C.R. Bard - 17-cv-598-1 COURT CLERK: The case is AngioDynamics, Inc., 2 versus C.R. Bard, Inc., et al., docket number 17-cv-598. 3 Appearances for the record, please. MR. IOVIENO: For the plaintiff, we have 4 Philip Iovieno for Boies, Schiller and Flexner. 5 6 here with my colleagues Anne Nardacci and Jack Dew. 7 THE COURT: Good morning, Counselors. 8 MR. IOVIENO: Good morning, your 9 understanding. 10 MR. MOSS: Good morning, your Honor. For the 11 defendants, it's Edward Moss from O'Melveny. My 12 colleague Colleen Powers is here as well. As I was 13 explaining earlier, Ms. Powers has not yet filed her admissions papers but we were informed that it was okay 14 15 for her to sit in. It is. 16 THE COURT: 17 MR. MOSS: Thank you, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Powers. Good 19 morning, Mr. Moss. 20 Mr. Iovieno, as a practical matter, could you 21 hear Mr. Moss? 22 MR. IOVIENO: I could. When I speak, there's 23 a bit of an echo so I will just try to speak slowly but 24 I can hear everything just fine. Thank you. 25 THE COURT: Good morning. I'm just going to

-AngioDynamics v C.R. Bard - 17-cv-598-

put on the record what has transpired, and we will try to address the myriad of issues which you presented this morning.

Docket No. 73 is a text order which I issued directing that all discovery be completed by March 12th of 2020 and that motions be filed by April 2nd of 2020. The Court set those deadlines in effort to have this matter trial ready for Judge Sannes by September because, among other reasons, if the case is not tried in September, it will go on Judge Sannes' list of reported case that are pending more than three years.

Docket No. 83 is a letter from defense counsel raising an issue that the plaintiffs have failed to comply with Rule 26 in their disclosure and specifically, objecting to a February 12th, 2020, supplemental response served by plaintiff and which, according to the defendants, they identified for the first time 75 hospitals where there may be potential witnesses to testify in this matter.

Docket No. 84 is a response from plaintiff's counsel which, among other things, asks for an opportunity to file a more detailed response to Docket No. 83.

Docket No. 86 is a detailed response from plaintiff's counsel indicating their position that they,

-AngioDynamics v C.R. Bard - 17-cv-598-

among other things, have complied with Rule 26, and that this, in their view, is just yet another attempt by defendants to seek depositions beyond those which the Court has previously allowed.

Docket No. 87 is a request by defense counsel to file certain portions of their letter of March 11th, 2020, under seal. Docket No. 88 is a yet another letter forwarded to the Court regarding these ongoing discovery disputes. Docket No. 89 is a letter from plaintiff's counsel asking to file a response to Docket No. 88.

Docket No. 91 is a letter from plaintiff's counsel advising the Court that there's a new discovery dispute which was further addressed in Docket No. 92.

It appears that the dispute has arisen regarding seeking discovery regarding C3 wave technology.

Docket No. 93 is a letter indicating that a dispute has arisen regarding taking the testimony of testimony of at least three witnesses. The plaintiff wishing to have those witnesses deposed by video and the defendants seeking them to do them in person. Docket No. 95 is another letter regarding that dispute.

Mr. Iovieno, if I start with you, rather than Mr. Moss, Mr. Moss indicates for the first time you have indicated that there are potentially 75 hospitals from which you may seek to call people to testify at the time

2

3

4

5

9

10

11

13

14

15

18

19

21

24

25

-AngioDynamics v C.R. Bard - 17-cv-598-

of trial and I quess my question is: At what point in this process do you intend to advise Mr. Moss and Ms. Powers who you actually intend to call? MR. IOVIENO: So, your Honor, first of all, the hospital that we identified in our initial disclosures were simply just conforming initial 6 7 disclosures for the same exact hospitals we had 8 disclosed in July last year and October of last year. Same exact hospitals that Mr. Moss made a motion on in September of last year seeking more depositions, which you gave him some limited relief; he chose not to 12 disclose any of those hospitals in September. THE COURT: I guess, Mr. Iovieno, let me stop you there. At any point in time have you advised Mr. Moss whom you intend to produce at trial to testify 16 regarding these issues? 17 MR. IOVIENO: Well, your Honor, we --THE COURT: Mr. Iovieno, this is going to go much more quickly if you respond to my questions rather 20 than speechifying. So let me ask you again: At what point in 22 time do you intend to advise Mr. Moss of those folks who 23 you intend to call to testify at the trial of this matter in front of Judge Sannes? MR. IOVIENO: When there is a trial witness

-AngioDynamics v C.R. Bard - 17-cv-598-

1 list that is submitted and exchanged between the 2 parties, we will list our witnesses at that point. Your 3 Honor, we --THE COURT: Mr. Iovieno, when is he entitled 4 5 to depose these people, then? MR. IOVIENO: Your Honor, it will come --6 7 he -- we will not be -- no one on our trial witness list 8 will not be someone that we identify in discovery. 9 THE COURT: Who have you identified for each 10 of these 75 hospitals who is going to testify at trial? 11 If you have done that, I have missed that in your 12 letters when I looked at this yesterday. 13 MR. IOVIENO: Okay. Let me just say, first of all, it's not 75, it's 25. 14 15 THE COURT: I'm just reading from Mr. Moss's 16 letter of March 3rd of 2020 in which he indicates that 17 your interrogatory responses name 75 hospitals. 18 stop there for a moment. 19 Mr. Moss, you've represented to the Court as 20 an attorney that they identified 75 hospitals. Is that 21 correct or incorrect? 22 MR. MOSS: Your Honor, I believe what I 23 represented to the Court is that there are 75 hospitals 24 combined that were identified in our interrogatories and

> Lisa L. Tennyson, CSR, RMR, FCRR UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT - NDNY

25

in their interrogatories.

```
-AngioDynamics v C.R. Bard - 17-cv-598-
1
               THE COURT:
                           That's not particularly clear from
2
    your letter.
 3
               MR. MOSS: Okay. But if you -- I apologize
     for that, your Honor, but let me clarify. They say in
 4
     their supplemental initial disclosure we have added to
 5
 6
     our disclosure any witness who was identified on Bard's
 7
     supplemental interrogatory responses or AngioDynamic's
8
     supplemental.
 9
               Ms. Powers actually did the work and -- and
10
     looked at all of those lists and deduced, because they
11
    didn't give us names. They just referred to --
12
               THE COURT: How many new hospitals?
13
               MR. MOSS: There are 75 total hospitals.
               THE COURT: You as well should probably listen
14
15
     to my question.
16
               How many new hospitals did the plaintiffs
17
     identify in their February 12th, 2020, response?
18
               MR. MOSS: Your Honor, I'm sorry --
19
               THE COURT: Again, Mr. Moss, I'm reading from
20
                   Why don't you take out Docket No. 83.
    your letter.
21
               MR. MOSS: Okay, your Honor.
                                              This is
22
     the March 11th letter?
23
               THE COURT: No, it's the March 3rd letter, I
    believe.
24
25
               MR. MOSS:
                          Okay.
                 Lisa L. Tennyson, CSR, RMR, FCRR
                UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT - NDNY
```

-AngioDynamics v C.R. Bard - 17-cv-598-

THE COURT: March 3rd. On March 3rd it appears to -- at least to me, that your office filed a letter, which is Docket No. 83, which is four pages in length, which is signed by you, Mr. Moss.

MR. MOSS: Yes.

THE COURT: In it, if you look at paragraph
2 -- excuse me -- paragraph 3, beginning with the words
"together."

MR. MOSS: Yes.

THE COURT: Together those interrogatory responses name 75 hospitals. My question simply is: My reading of your letter, which apparently is incorrect, is that plaintiff's counsel has recently identified 75 hospitals. Mr. Iovieno says they have identified 25 hospitals in their most-recent response.

My question simply is: On February 12th of 2020 AngioDynamics served supplemental initial disclosures. Did they identify 75 new hospitals or 25 new hospitals?

MR. MOSS: They identified exactly what's in the block quote above and nothing more. They identified representatives of each of the hospitals identified in -- that's all they identified.

THE COURT: Then it says in supplemental responses to Bard's interrogatories. I apologize if I'm

-AngioDynamics v C.R. Bard - 17-cv-598-1 being unclear. Did they identify a number of new 2 hospitals? 3 MR. MOSS: All they did was identify -- they said look at all of the old initial -- look at our 4 5 interrogatory responses, look at your interrogatory responses, and we may call any one of those hospitals 6 7 that appears on several lists in those interrogatory 8 responses. 9 THE COURT: So these are not new named 10 hospitals but hospitals that are garnered for their 11 earlier interrogatory response and your response? 12 MR. MOSS: Correct, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: How many of those hospitals were identified by you and how many of them were identified 14 15 by them? I believe we identified -- I think 16 MR. MOSS: 17 Mr. Iovieno has this in his letter. I think it's about 18 20 -- 15 or 20 that we did and the rest were theirs. 19 THE COURT: Mr. Iovieno, you said you recently 20 identified 25 hospitals. Where did that number come 21 from? 22 MR. IOVIENO: Hang on one second. 23 THE COURT: Take your time, Counselor. 24 MR. IOVIENO: Your Honor, it was 25 hospitals 25 and there are several different lists but on this issue

-AngioDynamics v C.R. Bard - 17-cv-598that Mr. Moss is talking about, there's 25 hospitals. 1 2 THE COURT: So as of February 12th of 2020, 3 you identified 25 new hospitals or are these hospitals that have previously been disclosed? 4 MR. IOVIENO: No new hospitals, 25 -- what we 5 6 did is conform our initial disclosures to what was previously disclosed. No new hospitals. 7 8 THE COURT: Is that your understanding, 9 Mr. Moss, or is it different? 10 MR. MOSS: No. All that they disclosed in 11 their initial disclosures was this block quote. 12 didn't give any list. They just referred us to the 13 supplemental responses to our and their interrogatory responses. We had to count them up and there were 75. 14 15 If he's now saying, well, it's only the ones we produced 16 in response to interrogatory number 3 or number 4, maybe 17 that's what Mr. Iovieno is saying now, and that would be 18 a start towards narrowing this.

THE COURT: Is that what you're saying,

Mr. Iovieno, or are you saying something different?

MR. IOVIENO: No, that is exactly what we're saying, your Honor.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MOSS: But it wasn't in the letter so we don't know which --

THE COURT: So now that we have made that --

-AngioDynamics v C.R. Bard - 17-cv-598-

so now you're identifying 25 hospitals which you are putting the defendants on notice you may call witnesses from. Is that correct, Mr. Iovieno?

MR. IOVIENO: Correct. Yes. The same hospitals we had previously identified, we are just confirming our initial --

THE COURT: Mr. Iovieno, if you could just once during the rest of my tenure here answer one of my questions directly, that would be appreciated.

My question simply is, Counselor: Have you now limited the potential pool of hospitals from whom you may call a witness to 25? Is that correct?

MR. IOVIENO: Correct.

THE COURT: All right. And when do you anticipate advising them of the name of the witnesses who you may call?

MR. IOVIENO: Your Honor, our intent was at the time when the trial witness lists are exchanged between the parties. We say in our letter, if you look on page 3 of our letter, we cite the case law where it says very clearly that initial disclosures, you just need to identify the corporate name. We do not need to identify the names.

Now, at the end of the day, there are multiple names of these different hospitals. The most efficient

-AngioDynamics v C.R. Bard - 17-cv-598-

way, if Mr. Moss had wanted to depose any of these hospitals, would be to simply issue a corporate representative deposition for the person most knowledgeable at the hospital and they would have put it up.

We do not disclose names because it would be multiple names but the hospitals -- the key thing -- and that's what the case law cannot be any more clear in saying, it's cited right in our letter.

THE COURT: So, Mr. Iovieno, you think it's all right if you wait until you file your witness list three weeks before trial to tell them who you are going to call? Is that what you're telling me?

MR. IOVIENO: No, no, no. Not at all, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, when do you plan on telling them, Counselor?

MR. IOVIENO: Your Honor, the names of the hospitals are the ones we identified. If you are talking about the name -- the specific name of the individual at the hospital --

THE COURT: That's correct. That's what I'm talking about. The people who you actually intend to clearly call into court and put in the witness chair.

MR. IOVIENO: Your Honor, let me just say

—AngioDynamics v C.R. Bard - 17-cv-598—

quickly, I will directly respond. That the case law we cited --

of directly responding, we clearly have different ideas. If you are trying to try my patience, Mr. Iovieno, you're gone pretty far down that road and let me make it clear to you, Counselor, that's not something you want to do.

So let's try one more time for you to try to answer one of my questions.

When do you intend to tell them the specific people you intend to call to testify in the trial in front of Judge Sannes?

MR. IOVIENO: Our intent was a specific person from the hospital would be disclosed, if we used them and if this issue was still alive after summery judgment, when they exchange trial witness lists. If you'd rather name from each hospital, I will disclose them now. It's not a problem to do it.

THE COURT: Don't you think like the purpose of the federal rules it would prevent surprise at trial? You are going to call a witness, they will have no idea what their testimony is going to be.

MR. IOVIENO: If it's the hospital, your Honor. It's not the name of the individual, the

```
-AngioDynamics v C.R. Bard - 17-cv-598-
1
    hospital --
               THE COURT: Mr. Iovieno, clearly -- clearly I
2
 3
    don't have your skills as an attorney, and I understand
 4
    my limitations, but I clearly didn't think you wanted to
 5
     call a physical building in here to testify. I assumed
 6
    you were going to call an individual.
 7
               You know, let's do this the hard way.
8
               Do you want to make a motion of some kind,
 9
    Mr. Moss, with respect to this?
10
               MR. MOSS: Yes, I'm happy to, your Honor.
11
               THE COURT: What kind of motion do you want to
12
    make?
               MR. MOSS: I want to make a -- well, a motion
13
     to compel them to tell us which individual witnesses
14
15
     they're going to call.
16
               THE COURT: When do you want to file your
17
    motion?
18
               MR. MOSS: And if they don't do that, to
19
    preclude.
20
               THE COURT: When do you want to file your
21
    motion by?
22
               MR. MOSS:
                         Can we have a week, your Honor?
23
               THE COURT: You can have two weeks.
24
               MR. MOSS: Okay.
                                 Thank you.
25
               THE COURT: We are in the middle of a
                 Lisa L. Tennyson, CSR, RMR, FCRR
                UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT - NDNY
```

```
-AngioDynamics v C.R. Bard - 17-cv-598-
1
    pandemic.
2
               MR. IOVIENO: Your Honor, can I just be heard
 3
     for one second?
               THE COURT: No.
                                You've been heard and you've
 4
    been absolutely unhelpful, Mr. Iovieno. You've done
 5
 6
     nothing but obstruct and refuse to answer my questions.
 7
               This is a self-inflicted wound. I was trying
8
     to move the matter forward toward trial. You clearly
     don't want to do that, so we are going to do it this
 9
10
    way.
11
               MR. IOVIENO:
                             I was just going to say --
12
               THE COURT: Mr. Iovieno, when I tell you not
13
     to speak, do not speak. Do you understand that,
14
    Counselor?
15
               MR. IOVIENO: Yes, your Honor.
16
               THE COURT: You will file your motion by
17
    April 3rd.
18
               MR. MOSS: Sure, your Honor. That's fine.
19
     Thank you.
20
               THE COURT: Mr. Iovieno, you will file your
21
     response by April 17th. I also understand we have a
22
     dispute regarding some discovery you want to conduct,
23
    Mr. Moss. Is that true?
24
               MR. MOSS: That is correct, your Honor.
               THE COURT: When do you want to file your
25
                 Lisa L. Tennyson, CSR, RMR, FCRR
                UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT - NDNY
```

```
-AngioDynamics v C.R. Bard - 17-cv-598-
1
    motion with respect to that issue?
2
               MR. MOSS: We can do it on the same day.
 3
               THE COURT: File your motion regarding the
     other issue --
 4
 5
               MR. MOSS: C3 wave issue.
               THE COURT: I'm sorry?
 6
 7
               MR. MOSS:
                          The C3 wave issue? Is that the
8
     issue?
 9
               THE COURT: Yes, the C3 wave issue.
10
               MR. MOSS: Yes, your Honor.
11
               THE COURT: File your motion to compel by
12
    April 3rd.
13
               MR. MOSS:
                         That's fine, your Honor.
                                                     Thank
14
    you.
15
               THE COURT: And you will file your responses
16
    by April 17th. The other dispute is you want to do some
17
     depositions in person?
18
               MR. MOSS: Yes, your Honor, or we want to --
19
     or we want a 30-day continuance.
20
               THE COURT:
                           That's denied. You can do that by
21
    video. We are in the middle of a pandemic, Counselor.
22
     The fact that you are here this morning in person shows
23
     remarkably bad judgment, in my view. The depositions
24
    will be done by video.
25
               Anything else you want to address this
                 Lisa L. Tennyson, CSR, RMR, FCRR
                UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT - NDNY
```

```
-AngioDynamics v C.R. Bard - 17-cv-598-
1
    morning, Mr. Moss?
2
               MR. MOSS: No, your Honor. We do believe that
 3
    we would --
               THE COURT: Mr. Moss, that issue has been
 4
 5
    resolved. If you are unhappy with it, take an appeal to
     the District Court Judge. Judge Sannes will be happy to
 6
7
    hear from you, I'm certain. Anything else you want to
8
     address?
 9
               MR. MOSS: I do not.
10
               THE COURT: Mr. Iovieno, anything else you
11
    want to address this morning?
12
               MR. IOVIENO: I would make more point on the
13
    demand but if you don't want to hear it, I will not.
14
               THE COURT: We are all done here. You have a
15
    good day. We're done.
16
               MR. IOVIENO:
                             Thank you, your Honor.
17
               MR. MOSS: Thank you, your Honor.
18
               THE COURT: Yes.
19
               (Proceeding concluded)
                       * * * * * * * * * *
20
21
22
23
24
25
                 Lisa L. Tennyson, CSR, RMR, FCRR
                UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT - NDNY
```

-AngioDynamics v C.R. Bard - 17-cv-598-

CERTIFICATION

I, Lisa L. Tennyson, RMR, CSR, CRR, Federal
Official Realtime Court Reporter, in and for the United
States District Court for the Northern District of New
York, do hereby certify that pursuant to Section 753,
Title 28, United States Code, that the foregoing is a
true and correct transcript of the stenographically
reported proceedings held in the above-entitled matter
and that the transcript page format is in conformance
with the regulations of the Judicial Conference of the
United States.

Lisa L. Tennyson, RMR, RPR, FCRR